

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-11 are pending herein. Claims 1, 6, 7 and 10 have been amended to clarify that the claimed content data processing system includes first and second content data creating modules. Claims 7-11 have been amended to clarify the structures by which the claimed process steps are performed. The specification has been amended for clarification purposes only.

1. The objection to the specification is noted, but deemed moot in view of the substitute specification paragraphs filed herewith.
2. The rejection of claims 7-11 under §101 is noted, but deemed moot in view of the rewritten claims submitted above.
3. Claims 1-6 were rejected under §102(b) over LaLonde et al. (WO 94/15294). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Pending independent claim 1 recites, among other things, a content data processing system that includes a notice control module for controlling a notice of prize information and a registration control module for registering, as applicant information, attributes of applicants who have applied for the prize information. WO '294, discussed below, fails to disclose or suggest these claimed features.

The PTO is apparently arguing that disclosure in WO '294 of a buyer's individualized catalogue, which is created by the buyer's electronic agent based on the buyer's stored interests, corresponds to a "notice control module for controlling a notice of prize information," as recited in pending claim 1. The PTO's reasoning is, apparently, that the individualized catalogue and the claimed prize information "both solicit information from applicants or users" (see Office Action page 8). The following discussion will show that the individualized catalogue disclosed by WO '294 does not solicit information from an applicant

who is applying for a prize (as claimed), but is sent to users in response to information that the users have already input into the system. As such, this rejection should be withdrawn.

WO '294 discloses an interactive computer system in which buyer characteristics or preferences are stored in a buyer database. The buyer characteristics and preferences are stored for consumers who have actively initiated communication with the system using, for example, telephone communication, telefax communication, modem communication, etc... (see page 5, lines 31-37). WO '294 discloses that buyers and sellers create a buyer's and a seller's electronic agent corresponding to the buyer's interests and the seller's products, respectively (see page 5, lines 12-30). Upon a request by the buyer (e.g., when the consumer places an order) or at periodic intervals, the buyer's electronic agent prepares an individualized catalogue of the seller's products that is tailored to the buyer's interests or desires with respect to a particular type of product(s) (see page 6, lines 11-31).

WO '294 does not disclose or suggest a system having a notice control module for controlling a notice of prize information, as claimed. As is clear from the discussion above, the system disclosed in WO '294 provides information to users only in response to a request for information or provides unsolicited information to persons about whom the system has stored interests or characteristics (see page 6, lines 5-10). In either of the above situations, the user has actively initiated the first communication with the system in order to specifically register information in the system. The individualized electronic catalogue, therefore, does not function to solicit information from a buyer, but is sent to buyers in response to information that the buyers have already input into the system.

Moreover, the information sent to users by way of the individualized catalogue disclosed by WO '294 does not correspond to "a notice of prize information," as is recited in pending claim 1. As such, the PTO's apparent position that the individualized electronic

catalogue corresponds to the claimed "notice control module" that controls the prize information is clearly erroneous. WO '294 simply does not employ a notice control module controlling a prize page (as illustrated, for example, in Figs. 2 and 3 of the present application) to entice users to submit information into the system's database. There is no disclosure or suggestion in WO '294 that the system users are given the chance to win a prize. Again, the buyer's individual electronic catalogue is generated based on information that the buyer has already submitted to the system.

Furthermore, since the users of the system disclosed by WO '294 could not reasonably be considered "applicants who applied for the prize information," as recited in pending claim 1, WO '294 does not disclose or suggest "a registration control module for registering...applicant's information," as claimed. The users of the system disclosed by WO '294 are not *applicants* within the meaning of the present claims, especially since they do not apply for the chance to win a prize.

In view of all of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection over WO '294 are respectfully requested.

4. Claims 7-11 were rejected under §102(b) over Rogers et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Rogers discloses a system in which a retailer registers (in a database) individual product identification information relating to products at the point of sale (see Abstract, lines 5-8, Col. 4, lines 53-63, Col. 4, lines 44-45). Pending independent claim 7, however, recites "a step of controlling a notice of prize information." For instance, Fig. 2 of the present application illustrates an example of the "notice of prize information" page offering consumers a chance to win a prize in exchange for providing applicant information in the system. The PTO's apparent position on page 10 of the Office Action that Rogers' electronic

registration process corresponds to controlling a notice of prize information, as claimed, is clearly erroneous. Rogers discloses only that the system registers product information. There is absolutely no disclosure or suggestion in Rogers that the product information registered in Rogers' system is even prize information, let alone that the system controls a notice of prize information, as claimed. This rejection should be withdrawn for this reason alone.


Moreover, since Rogers discloses registering only product information in a database, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Rogers of "a step of registering, as applicant information, attributes of applicants who applied for the prize information," as recited in pending claim 7. Nor does Rogers disclose "a step of creating content data in accordance with the attributes of the applicants in the applicant information," as claimed. Again, Rogers does not register applicant information in the system, let alone use the attributes of the applicants from the applicant information to create and transmit content data, as claimed. These are further reasons that this rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of all of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection over Rogers are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that contact with Applicant's attorney would be advantageous toward the disposition of this case, the Examiner is herein requested to call Applicant's attorney at the phone number noted below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1446.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen P. Burr
Reg. No. 32,970

June 28, 2004

Date

SPB:SWC:jms

BURR & BROWN
P.O. Box 7068
Syracuse, NY 13261-7068

Customer No.: 025191
Telephone: (315) 233-8300
Facsimile: (315) 233-8320